

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/724,971	Applicant(s) COURNOYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1626	

All Participants:
Status of Application: 71

 (1) Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.

(3) _____.

 (2) Brian L. Buckwalter {Reg. No. 46,585}.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 December 2006
Time: 10:49am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:


Claims discussed:

1 and 45

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Applicant's representative to request permission to correct the 35 USC 112, second issues, in all occurrences, mentioned in the Office Action dated June 19, 2006 on page 4. On same day @11:52am, Mr. Buckwalter called the Examiner back and gave the Examiner permission to make the changes. On Thursday, December 21, 2006 @2:05pm, the Examiner requested permission to put back the original language under the definitions of R(a) and R(b) in claims 1 and 45.

SS
12/21/06